Sri D. DEVARAJ URS.—In view of the unsatisfactory working of the tractor services, is it not better to close them down ?

Sri H. S. RUDRAPPA.—It is not advisable to do so in view of the heavy demand because the poor people cannot purchase, own and cultivate their lands. Therefore, we have made arrangements to work them on a 'no loss no profit' basis and therefore these services are necessary.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question time is over.

QUESTION FOR ANSWER ON THE DAY

(but not taken up)

Leakage of Municipal Octroi in Channapatna.

Q.—566. Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA (Channapatna).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether they are aware that there is heavy leakage in the collection of octroi in the Municipality, Channapatna ;

(*b*) whether Government propose to investigate into the affairs of the collection of Octroi of the Municipality ?

A.—Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH (Minister for Local Self-Government).—

(*a*) No.

(*b*) Does not arise in view of reply to Clause (*a*).

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

Sri C. M. POONACHA (Minister for Industries and Home Affairs).—Sir, I lay on the table, the Mysore Sales of Motor Spirit (Taxation) Rules, 1957, issued under Section 27 of the Mysore Sales of Motor Spirit Taxation Act, 1957.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA (Minister for Labour and Legal Affairs).—Sir, I lay on the Table the Mysore Sales Tax Rules, 1957 issued under sub-section (1) of Section 38 of the Mysore Sales Tax Act, 1957.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA (Minister for Labour and Legal Affairs).—Sir, I lay on the Table the Mysore Agricultural Income Tax Rules, 1957, issued under sub-sections (1) and (2) of Section 63 of the Mysore Agricultural Income Tax Act, 1957.

RULES OF PROCEDURE AND CONDUCT OF BUSINESS IN THE MYSORE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, AS REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE.

Motion to consider.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE (Chikodi).—I request that I may be permitted to make the motion which stands in the name of Shri L. H. Thimma Bovi.

*Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Gubbi).—I rise to a point of order. There is a convention that in the absence of a Minister, another Minister can answer. In the absence of the Deputy Speaker, how can another member of this, august House be permitted to move any motion or any resolution on behalf of the Deputy Speaker ? I want a ruling from the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In the first place, Sri Kothavale has been authorised by Sri Thimma Bovi, Deputy Speaker. In the seconed place, Sri Kothavale is a member of the Rules Committee. So any member of the Rules Committe can make the motion.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—My point is that one of the members of the Panel of Chairmen may be authorised to make the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The following are the members:—

Sriyuths—

S. R. Kanthi (*Chairman*)
S. Nijalingappa
M. Madiah
V Venkatappa
S. D. Kothavale
B. Vaikunta Baliga
P. G. Sidhanthi

(MR. SPEAKER)

Sriyuths—
M. V. Rama Rao
B. S. Kushalappa
Veerendra Patil
J. Mohamed Imam
K. Pattabhi Raman.

So the Hon'ble Member will realise that Sri Kothavale was one of the members of the Rules Committee and any member of the Committee can make the motion. In fact, he has been authorised to do so.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA (Channapatna).—Sri Mohamed Imam and Sri Pattabhiraman are on the Committee. I want to know whether the Committee is still existing?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It does not exist.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—Then how is it possible for a member of the Committee constituted ten years back .....

Mr. SPEAKER.—It was not constituted ten years back. It was set up only recently. I will read Rule 248 also.

"(2) If the Assembly is unable to consider the report of a Committee presented to it, by reason of the dissolution of the Assembly, the report shall be considered by the next Assembly as if it were a report presented to it by one of its committees."

So this House is entitled to consider it and any member of the Rules-making Committee can move it. I do not see any difficulty there.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—Under what provision of the Rules of Procedure a member of the Committee can make the motion?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is only a convention. The point is that this Committee called the Rule-making Committee was appointed under Article 208 by the Speaker and the Committee submitted a Report. The Report was submitted in fact before the old Assembly was dissolved and now this Assembly, as the relevant rule just now read out says, is entitled to consider the Report. Any member of the Committee can present it. Of course, Sri Thimma Bovi would have done it but for the fact that he is not keeping well. He has authorised Sri S. D. Kothavale to do so.

***Sri N. RACHIAH** (Hunsur).—In regard to the Committees appointed by the House, the parliamentary convention is that the Chairman or any member can move the concerned motion only when the Committee authorises such member and not otherwise. As such, the moving by any Hon'ble Member of such motion is not in order unless he is authorised by such Committee, and as such, I do not think Hon'ble Member who intends making the motion is authorised by the previous Committee.

ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ (ಚಾಮರಾಜನಗರ).—ಈಗ ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದಪ್ರಕಾರ ತಿಮ್ಮಾಬೋವಿ ಅವರು ಈ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆಯೇ ವಿನಾ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸೂಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಕಾರಣಗಳಿವೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಕಳೆದ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇದು ಇಂಟ್ರೊಡ್ಯೂಸ್ ಆಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದರಿ.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have already given a ruling that any member of the Committee can make a motion in this respect.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA.—Whether such Committee is in existence is the question here. It is not at all in existence.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No Committee when it finishes work can exist. The Committee was constituted for the simple purpose of making rules and after the rules were made by it, the Committee does not exist now as it has finished its work.

As regards Sri N. Rachiah's point, there is no such rule amongst our Rules of Procedure that the Committee should authorise any one of its members to make a motion in this respect. That it is so in the Lok Sabha I am not aware. But there is no such rule here. In the State Assemblies; as far as I am aware, there is a convention or a sort of an understanding that any member of the Committee may make a motion.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA.—I am not opposing the ruling. I want to know information from the Chair.

*Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Challakere).—A Committee was appointed by the previous House which was dissolved subsequently. When the House is dissolved, the members of that House are no longer there. If we are again elected, we are elected on a different basis. Therefore, that Commmittee is not in existence and it is not correct that anybody could represent that Committee. Under these circumstances, I would suggest to you most humbly that a new Committee may be appointed because the members of that Committee go along with the dissolved House itself. For example, take Sri Pattabhiraman or Sri Imam, are they still in this Committee? Similarly, if somebody else who was a member of that Committee is here, he is elected afresh and that benefit does not inure to him. Therefore, it is not a committee in existence and nobody can represent that Committee except the Deputy Speaker who after all is the Chairman of that Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He is not the Chairman of the Committee.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—If that is not the case, nobody can represent such a Committee at all.

*Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangud).—You were pleased to say that once the work was taken up by a particular Committee for framing rules, that Committee ceased to function after the submission of a report and that it is not necessary that the Committee should authorise any member to make the motion. In view of the ruling, is it open to the members to again raise the issue?

Mr. SPEAKER.—After all, in this case what Sri Bheemappa Naik said was what I said a few minutes back. I did not say that the Committee exists at all. The Committee came to an end after it made a report in that respect. The point is who should make a motion in respect of the report of the Committee to be taken into consideration in this House.

I must make it clear that though the Committee does not exist, some members of the Committee are also members of this House and so any one of them can make the motion. It is only if members want a revision of the rules that have been framed by the ex-committee, they are at liberty to make a motion in this respect for the appointment of another committee.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I want a small clarification; suppose those members who were in the previous Committee had not been elected again; what would have happened?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I cannot give a reply to a hypothetical question. Many members of that Committee are here. I was also Speaker at that time. I could have myself proposed it to the House but I thought it was not fair to the Chair. So I have asked one of the members to do that.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—Sir, a question of privilege is involved here.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No privilege is involved. The Hon'ble Member may resume his seat. If the Hon'ble Member is of opinion that a question of privilege is involved he may give it in writing.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—I may bring to the notice of the House the relevant rules. I am not questioning the ruling of the Chair.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member is questioning the chairs ruling indirectly. The Hon'ble Member may resume his seat. You should put an end to this. I have said that any member of this Committee who is a member of this House can make a motion. There is no need for further arguments. I think the chapter is closed.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—There I agree with the Speaker. Any member of that Committee who happens to be a member of this House may make a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Kothavale may make the motion.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—Sir, I move:

"That the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly, as reported by the Rules Committee, be taken into consideration."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

"That the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly, as reported by the Rules Committee be taken into consideration."

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—I have an amendment to move.

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY (Bangalore South).—Has notice of the amendment that my friend wants to move given to the Secretary as prescribed in the rules ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not given.

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY.—Then how can he move an amendment now?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—If it is contrary to the rules, I shall sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is the Hon'ble Member quoting rule 51 ?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I am quoting 68 (2). So far as rule 185 (2) is concerned, it says that whatever is applicable to the report of a Select Committee is also applicable to this report. Rule 68 (2) runs thus :

"If the member in charge moves that the Bill be taken into consideration, any member may move as an amendment that the Bill be re-committed or be circulated or recirculated for the purpose of obtaining opinion or further opinion thereon."

So whatever is applicable to the report of a Select Committee is applicable to this report also. In view of this, I can move an amendment only when there is a consideration motion. I cannot do it at any other time.

Mr. SPEAKER.—May I know whether the Hon'ble Member has given notice of an amendment ? I allow the amendment to be given. If he has an amendment he may please pass it on.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Does the Hon'ble Speaker want it in writing ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member may move it orally and then give it in writing.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—There is no need to give it in writing. He has a right to move an amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The consideration motion has been moved. Now I understand that Sri M. C. Narasimhan is insistent on moving an amendment. Let him move it, I have no objection. Already an amendment has been received in the office and I want that amendment to be moved first and then Sri Narasimhan may move his amendment orally. He may give it in writing afterwards.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA (Minister for Labour and Legal Affairs).—Sir, before moving my amendment, I wish to make one position clear. The Committee was not appointed by the previous House. It was appointed by the Speaker and therefore any idea that the dissolution of that committee has an effect upon this report may be brushed aside. So far as the report which has been presented to the House is concerned, it is open to any member of the Committee to move for its consideration. There is a slight distinction to be borne in mind, namely, that when a committee has been appointed for a specific purpose and when it submits a report it becomes *functus officio* to that extent but it does not at all mean that the persons who constituted the committee do not continue to be members of that commitee. Though they cannot function for the submission of a report, they could function for the purpose of making the motion before the House. Therefore, there is absolutely no defect, if I may put it, in the procedure that has been followed just now. With these prefatory ramarks, I move the following amendment to to the consideration motion :—

"That the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly, as reported by the Rules Committee, be referred to a Special Committee consisting of the following Hon'ble Members for further consideration with a direction that the Report of the Committee be presented to the House within a period of 10 days from today :

1 Hon'ble the Speaker
(*Chairman*)

Sriyuths—

2 K. Kenchappa
3 Kadidal Manjappa
4 H. S. Rudrappa
5 J. H. Shamsuddin
6 H. V. Koujalgi
7 B. D. Jatti
8 G. Anna Rao
9 K. Hanúmanthaiya
10 V. Venkatappa
11 A. Bheemappa Naik
12 T. Subramanya
13 N. Rachiah
14 A. V. Narasimha Reddy
15 V. Srinivasa Shetty
16 S. Sharangowda
17 M. C. Narasimhan
18 Y. Veerappa
19 B. R. Sunthankar
20 K. S. Nagarathnamma

and the mover."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly, as reported by the Rules Committee, be referred to a Special Committee consisting of the following Hon'ble members for further consideration with a direction that the Report of the Committee be presented to the House within a period of 10 days from today :—

1 Hon'ble Speaker (*Chairman*)
2 Sri K. Kenchappa
3 ,, Kadidal Manjappa
4 ,, H. S. Rudrappa
5 ,, J. H. Shamasuddin
6 ,, H. V. Koujalgi
7 ,, B. D. Jatti
8 ,, G. Anna Rao
9 ,, K. Hanumanthaiya
10 ,, V. Venkatappa
11 ,, A. Bheemappa Naik
12 ,, T. Subramanya
13 ,, N. Rachiah
14 ,, A. V. Narasimha Reddy
15 ,, V. Srinivasa Shetty
16 ,, S. Sharangowda
17 ,, M. C. Narasimhan
18 ,, Y. Veerappa
19 ,, B. R. Sunthankar
20 Mrs. K. S. Nagarathnamma and the mover."

Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum).—The present motion that has been brought before the House is out of order for the following reason. Rule 184 reads thus :

"184 (1). Where a member has the leave of the Assembly to proceed, he shall move that the draft amendments be referred to a Special Committee.

(2) If that motion is carried, the draft amendments shall be referred to a Special Committee of which the Speaker shall be Chairman, and the Deputy Speaker shall be a member. The remaining members, who shall be seven in number, shall be elected by the Assembly by means of the single transferable vote."

So, the present Committee that has been proposed is outside the scope of the rules that are in force. I therefore suggest that the motion is out of order and cannot be taken up here at all.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—The motion is out of order, because, as I submitted earlier, according to rule 185, the procedure regarding Select Committee Reports are also applicable to this Report. There is no provision under rule 68 for the member in charge to withdraw the report much less it is open to the Law Minister to come forward and say that this Report need not be taken up for consideration for the moment and should be left to the purview of another Committee which has to be constituted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am unable to agree with the Hon'ble Members. We are not dealing with the question under rule 184. We are dealing with rule 185. I will read the rule for the benefit of the members.....

*Sri T. SUBRAMANYA (Turuvekere).—I have got a point to make, Mr. Speaker. Before the Chair gives a ruling, it is better some of us are allowed to speak on the subject as we are anxious for proper precedents to be laid down.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—I may be permitted to clarify one position, Sir.

(SRI B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA)

It is not at all my intention to prevent any debate upon the report. It is only with a view to facilitate the work of the House and avoid expenditure of time and maximise the utility, that I have moved the motion and also for the reason, of which the House is fully aware, that a detailed and long report has been placed before the House. Further, if we remember that there are various amendments in regard to the procedure to be followed and the bulk of work that is before us, my amendment is one which merits serious consideration at the hands of Hon'ble Members. One thing is certain here and that is the Report which has been placed here will not be a statute but is meant for the purpose of following correct procedures. It is not a question of any particular motion wherein a Bill has to be enacted as a statute. It is only for carifying the rules that are to be observed here that the Report is placed before us and my suggestion in sending this motion is only to facilitate the work of this House. It is not my desire to rule out any debate. It is only to save time and bulk of work that I have suggested for constitution of a Special Committee. It is only in that light I have moved the motion.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA —After going through rules 184, 185 and 186, I am of the opinion that a Special Committee of this nature cannot be appointed unless they are elected by single transferable vote. Now, the Hon'ble Minister for Law has moved for constitution of a Special Committee and that Committee to report to this House within 10 days. I therefore suggest a simpler method which may be accepted by the House in their wisdom. It is this: Instead of going through the Report that has been before us, let us appoint a small committee and let the Committee consider all aspects of that case and also other amendments and make a consolidated report and present it to the House. If a Special Committee is to be appointed, with all due deference to the Law Minister, it has to be by election and not by nomination as has been put down. Therefore, I humbly submit that the whole procedure may be simplified and a fresh Committee be appointed.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈಗ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಆಫ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್ ನಬ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವುದು ನಮ್ಮ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಂದು ಭಯವನ್ನು ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಏತಕ್ಕೆಂದರೆ ಇದು ನಾಮಿನೇಟೆಡ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಇದು ನಾಮಿನೇಟೆಡ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಅಲ್ಲ. The Committee will be appointed by the whole House.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಮೆಜಾರಿಟಿ ಮತ ಇರುವವರು ತಮಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದವರಿಗೆ, ಕೈ ಎತ್ತುವವರಿಗೆ ಸಮಿತಿಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. It is not a democratic method we are following.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Point of order. A little charfication. ಕೈ ಎತ್ತುವವರಿಗೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಬಹುದೆ!

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—You have to allow me some time to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no point of order.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA—I will clarify the position. ಕೈ ಎತ್ತಿದವರಿಗೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಅವರ ಸಪೋರ್ಟರ್ಸ್; ಸಪೋರ್ಟರ್ಸ್ ಎಂದರೆ ಒಂದು ಗುಂಪಿನವರು. ಈಗ ನಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಡಮೆ ಒಂದಲ್ಲ ಒಂದು ಪಾರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದವರು. ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಬಂದರೂ, ಒಂದು ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರು ಒಂದೇ ತರನಾದ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಗೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕಂಥವರು. ಬ್ರಿಟಿಷ್ ಹೌಸ್ ಆಫ್ ಕಾಮನ್ಸ್ ರೂಲ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಡ ಐವತ್ತು ಅರವತ್ತು ರೂಲುಗಳಿವೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ 180-200 ರೂಲುಗಳನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ; ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು 300 ರೂಲುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ಮಾತಿಗೆ (voice) ಅವಕಾಶವೇ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮಗೆ ಮುಕ್ಕಾಲು ಪಾಲು ಪ್ರೊಟೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಇರುವುದು ಸ್ಪೀಕರಿಂದ. ನಮ್ಮ ಪೊಸಿಷನ್ ಪ್ರೊಟೆಕ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್‌ರವರಿಗೆ ಯಾವಯಾವ ತರಹ ಪವರ್ಸ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಬಂದಿದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ಬೇಕಾದ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತೀನೆಂದರೆ ನನಗೇ ತುಂಬ ಸಂಕೋಚವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರು ತಂದಿರುವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಬೇರೆ. ತಾವು ಈಗ ಜನರಲ್ ಆಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಉಪಯೋಗವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಶ್ರೀ ನರಸಿಂಹ್ ಅವರು ತಂದಿರುವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ, ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಇವುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಒಂದು ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಎತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಹೇಳುವುದಿದ್ದರೆ ಹೇಳಿ. ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಅನಂತರ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದು.

(*Many members rose*)

Mr. SPEAKER.—I cannot give a chance to so many members on a point

of order. What is required is a short discussion. I am very reluctant to give time to so many members. In this respect, if one or two members give their advice to me to enable me to come to proper conclusions, it will be all right. But if the members go on talking on the point of order, it becomes a general debate.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, on the motion moved by the Hon'ble Minister for Law, I think it should confine itself to Section 184, that is, subject to the conditions mentioned in 184 (1) and (2), and I agree with Sri T. Subramanya that if it has got to be referred to a Special Committee that Committee should be elected by the House. This Committee proposed by the Hon'ble the Law Minister is a Special Committee. If that matter has got to be referred to the Special Committee, it must satisfy the conditions laid down in 184 (2).

Mr. SPEAKER.—I want to make the position clear. Chapter 17 applies to the amendments which are proposed to be made to the Rules of Procedure. The Rules of Procedure are here in this book. Chapter 17, Rules 182 to 186, apply to any amendments brought to amend the Rules of Procedure. It does not apply to the draft rules that have been framed under Article 208. That is why I am anxious that the Hon'ble Members will understand the difference. The difficulty is not that we are amending the Rules of Procedure. But we are taking into consideration the draft rules. That is why the Hon'ble Members will bear with me that this procedure is more or less of a different character altogether. That is why I would like the Hon'ble Members to understand me. The Rules Committee Report is before them. If they want to discuss, they may. If they want to refer it back to a committee which is acceptable to a majority of this House, I have no objection.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palaiyam).—Sir, my submission is that there is no scope to refer this matter to a special committee.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That stage comes afterwards.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—In view of rule 68(2), when a member moves the motion to take it into consideration and my friend Sri Narasimhan is attempting to move an amendment to that motion, there is no scope for any Hon'ble Member to refer the matter to the Select Committee. My friend Sri Kothavala has moved that this matter be taken into consideration and my friend Sri Narasimhan has moved that it be recirculated. When that stage is there, there is no scope to refer this matter to a Special Committee. Unless the member who moved this matter withdraws the motion, there is no question of referring it to a Special Committee. I therefore submit to you, Sir, to rule whether it is in order to refer this matter to a Special Committee in view of the fact that my friend is seeking to move an amendment that the matter be taken into consideration.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO (Mysore City).—Sir, I refer to 68(1) The Rules of Procedure as referred to by the Select Committee is presented to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Where is the Select Committee?

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—The Committee constituted to recommend.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will make it clear. There is a little bit of misunderstanding. The Committee that had been appointed by the Speaker had been appointed under Article 208. This is a Special Committee, but not a Select Committee. That Special Committee Report is before us. Either you adopt it with or without amendments or you may refer it back to another committee.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Sringeri).—No. We intend framing rules under Section 32 of the State Re-organisation Act.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No. No. This Report is under. . . .

*Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Under article 208 of the Constitution, we are framing new rules. We are not governed by the rules now in force. The rule referred to by Hon'ble Member

(SRI KADIDAL MANJAPPA)

Sri Narasimhan, *i.e.*, rule 68 and rules 182 to 186 which apply to amendments of the existing rules, these rules do not apply to the new Rules of Procedure. When you want to adopt, the House can adopt any procedure it likes provided it is equitable and convenient. The procedure suggested by the Hon'ble the Law Minister is perfectly in order.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY (Coondapur).—The main objective of the discussion is to have a good report. If I may be permitted to say so, we are missing the objective for which we are discussing the question. A number of amendments have been moved, more than a hundred or so. I am very doubtful whether by discussing all these amendments in this House, we can come to a fair conclusion or draft very good rules. I fully concur with the objective of the Hon'ble Minister or the ruling party. My own opinion is that it would be better to sit round a table in a committee and thrash out the matter in discussion. Then we can come to better conclusions and draft better rules than by discussing the same in the heated atmosphere of the Assembly. It may be a Special Committee or an ordinary committee or a Select Committee. The members of the committee may be different or we can add more members. Our purpose, the purpose of the ruling party and the purpose of the opposition can be served better by discussing round a Select Committee rather than discussing it in the open House. I do not think there will be any quarrel over this since our objective will be better served. I humbly request the Hon'ble Members to agree to this motion of amendment.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Does it mean that the existing rules must be infringed ?

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—I leave it to the Hon'ble Speaker. My sub-mission is that our objective will be better served by referring it to a Select Committee.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU (Cubbonpet).—Under what rules the motion made by the Hon'ble the Law Minister is before the House is not known because there is a conflict. Let us know under what provision, we are having this motion before us. The Hon'ble Speaker just now mentioned Rules 183, 184 and 185 apply to this. The Hon'ble Speaker has made very subtle distinction with regard to amendments and the Report. Therefore, if the amendment is not applicable and if it is placed as such, the three rules 183, 184 and 185 are not applicable. We come to the last Rule 186 which considers an unfinished report of a previous committee. What is the position to be adopted ? Therefore, I just say that, if at all we come within the purview of any rule, it is Rule 186 and the normal course that should be adopted for the presentation of the Report is as if it were the report of a committee and nothing more than that.

Sri D. DEVARAJ URS (Hunsur).—Sir, it is not as if we are not anxious to have progressive Rules. The point at issue is, under what provisions of the existing Rules the committee is to be appointed. The amendment moved by the Hon'ble the Minister for Law is to the motion before the House. The motion refers to the Report of the Committee for the purpose of drafting the Rules; and the amendment is in the form of an amendment to the motion. It is but right that we should think of the Rules under Chapter 17, which govern the amendment to rules; and if we want to appoint the committee proposed by the amendment of the Hon'ble Minister, it can be only a special committee, as was pointed out by the Hon'ble Member Sri T. Subramanya. It can never be any other committee. If it were to be a select committee, the matter is entirely different. This happens to be a special committee which shall be governed only by the Rules framed under Chapter 17.

There was another suggestion thrown that it may be in accordance with Rule 186. That rule refers to cases where a report is presented to an Assembly and that Assembly is dissolved before considering that report; and it says that such report may be taken up by the subsequent assembly as if presented

by one of its committees. This report unfortunately was not presented to the previous Assembly. The report is presented to us just now. Therefore, even 186 may not apply here. I therefore agree with the suggestion of Sri T. Subramanya that Rules 184 and 185 may be applied for the purpose of appointing the Special Committee.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, it was pointed out by your goodself and some other Members that Chapter 17 applies only to amendment of Rules under the Rules which govern the procedure and conduct of Business of this House as now obtaining. Sir, the House is quite aware that under Section 32 of the States Reorganisation Act, the Hon'ble Speaker was empowered to adopt a set of Rules for the Conduct of Business in this House and it is also stated there that these Rules would govern the procedure of this House till they are replaced by a set of Rules framed by this House. Now this House is seized of the question of framing the Rules for governing the conduct of business of this House. Various opinions are expressed as to the procedure to be adopted. Sir, after going through the Rules of Business, I find that such a contingency is not covered by any specific rules. When we are faced with such a handicap, I wish to refer to your consideration Rule 168 which reads like this:

> "All matters not specifically provided in these Rules and all questions relating to the detailed working of these rules shall be regulated in such manner as the Speaker may from time to time direct."

I submit that the matter that is now before this House is not specifically provided under these Rules, and as such Sir, it is entirely within the judicious discretion of the Speaker to adopt such procedure as he may be pleased to allow. Therefore, if the Hon'ble Speaker were to allow the motion that is moved by the Hon'ble Minister for Law, I take it that the Speaker has allowed it under Rule 168 and as such I feel that the procedure adopted is quite in order.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will draw the attention of the Hon'ble Members to Rules 182 to 185. They will see that if a motion is to be made for leave to amend these Rules, 15 days clear notice will have to be given along with the draft rules that means the procedure that is laid down in 182, 183, 184 and 185 does not apply to the present Draft Rules. After all, the draft rules are made on account of the fact that the Speaker was pleased to appoint a Committee under article 208. It is not an action taken under rule 182. It is an action taken under Article 208 of the Constitution. Therefore, the Hon'ble Members will see that the Rules of Procedure, namely, Nos. 182, 183, 184 and 185 do not apply; but the only rule that applies is that the report of the committee which was presented to the old Assembly shall also be considered by the next Assembly as if it were a report presented by one of its own committees. One relevant thing that applies to this case is this; The Hon'ble Member Sri Narasimhan seems to be under the impression that it is a Select Committee Report. This is not a Report of the Select Committee. This is a Report of the Special Committee appointed under Article 208 and Rule 68 does not apply. Naturally, what is the procedure that should be followed? This is more or less covered, as my Hon'ble friend Sri Puttaswamy said just now, by Rule 168—Residuary powers; and when I allow this Report to be moved here along with an amendment to it, I have used the powers under Rule 168.

In this case the procedure that we want to adopt is the procedure that we usually adopt in the case of Bills. It is for consideration and the amendment is moved. It is for consideration that if any Hon'ble Member wants to move an amendment, he should be allowed to do so without giving previous notice. I do not want to stand on formalities because I want the whole question to be thoroughly understood by the members.

The House will now rise and meet again at 3-30 P.M.

The House adjourned at Three of the Clock and re-assembled at Thirty Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

(Quorum was formed at 3-40 p.m.)

*Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE (Chikodi).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, the House well knows that the procedure of this House is being covered by the Rules of Procedure which were in force in the Legislative Assembly of the old Mysore State. By virtue of the provision of Section 32 of the States Reorganisation Act, these rules have got to be observed until new Rules are framed under Art. 208 of the Constitution of India subject to such modifications and adaptations as may be made by the Speaker. Now accordingly the old Mysore State Legislature Rules are in force subject to the modifications, adoptations and adaptations made by the Speaker. The Speaker of the previous Assembly of the new Mysore State appointed a Rules Committee for the purpose of framing Rules as is envisaged in the Constitution of India. I have had the honour to be a member of that Committee. The Committee after going through in detail, the Rules of Procedure which were in force in the State Legislatures as well as in the Lok Sabha have framed the Rules and the Rules are adopted generally on the basis of the Rules of procedure in the Lok Sabha. We are very anxious to have a new set of rules after the reorganisation of States, The reorganised State of Mysore consists of five parts and it is much better that new rules should be framed for the guidance and for regulating the business of this House. The Rules are there. Copies of the Report of the Rules Committee have been circulated to the Hon'ble Members. I therefore request the Hon'ble Members to adopt them subject to such amendments as in their wisdom they find it fit to be introduced.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—In the light of the discussion that has already taken place, I submit it would be proper and perhaps useful and expedient that the Rules which are fairly large in number and voluminous in content and also the large number of amendments that are to be considered, as was very rightly submitted by Sri Srinivas Shetty, be considered around a table, taking rule after rule and making such provision as may be necessary in the best interests of harmonious and smooth working of the House for the future. I would only contribute this one idea for the kind consideration of all the members. Ultimately, in the event of my amendment that the rules be referred to a Committee being accepted, we are not the only House that have to consider the matter. The Rules could be limited to a large extent by the rules prevailing elsewhere and particularly where the Lok Sabha has dealt with all these matters to a very large extent and it is for us to consider where the rules that are governing Lok Sabha would or would not be a substantial base and then try to have a comparative study of the rules obtaining in all the other Legislatures and also rules prevailing in this House during the last session and the Report which has been submitted, whether it would not be proper for us to concentrate attention in that matter and in that manner and call for a Report on all the aspects that arise and also any further suggestions that may be made. If I were to read every rule one after another it is only suggesting one aspect and it will entail an inordinately long time. Therefore, I suggest that any particular suggestions that members may want to make may kindly be made; otherwise my motion of an amendment that the Rules as reported by the Rules Committee be referred to a Committee may kindly be considered.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ (ಹಿರಿಯೂರು).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈಗ ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ Rules of Procedure ಮತ್ತು Conduct of Business ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಅನುಸರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ನಿಯಮಾವಳಿಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಮಗೆ ಎಂಥೆಂಥ ಕಷ್ಟಗಳು ಒದಗಿದವು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಯಾವಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾರ್ಪಡಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಕಂಡುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈಗ ತಾನೆ ನಡೆದ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವಾರು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳು

ಬಂದಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ, ಈಗ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ಗಳನ್ನೇ ನಾವು ಮುಂದೆಯೂ ಅನುಸರಿಸಿ ಬಹುದು ಎಂಬ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬಂತು. ಆದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಈಗಿನ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷದ ಅನುಭವದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕಾನೇಕ ತೊಡರುಗಳನ್ನು ನಾವುಎದುರಿಸ ಬೇಕಾದ ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಹಿಂದೆ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ಗಳ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮಗೆ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅನುಭವದ ಅನುಕೂಲವನ್ನೂ ಪಡೆದು, ಜೊತೆಗೆ ವಿವಿಧ ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿರುವ ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ಗಳನ್ನೂ, ಲೋಕಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ಗಳನ್ನೂ ತಕ್ಕಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅಳವಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿನ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಸುಗಮವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುವಂತೆ ಮೂಡಬಹುದು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಪರಿಗಣನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ನಮ್ಮ ನಿಯಮಾವಳಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈಗ ಆಗಿರ ತಕ್ಕ ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ಗಳನ್ನೇ ಮುಂದೆಯೂ ಅನುಸರಿಸಿರಿ, ಅದನ್ನೇ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಎಂದು ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಬಾರಿ ಪುನರಾಲೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿ ಎಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದಿಷ್ಟೆ. ನಾವು ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಅನುಭವಿಸಿದ್ದರಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೇಜಸ್ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳು ಉದ್ಭವಿಸಿದವು. ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆ ಬಂದಾಗ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವಾರು ಜಿಜ್ಞಾಸೆಗಳು ಕೂಡ ಬಂದವು. ಈ ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ, ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ವಿವೇಚನೆಗೇ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಅವರೇನು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದೆನ್ನುವ ಭಾವನೆಯನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ. ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೂ ಕೂಡ ಕೆಲವಾರು ನಿಯಮಾವಳಿಗೇ ಬದ್ಧರಾಗಿರಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ನ್ಯಾಯ ವೆಂಬ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ಹೊಸ ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈಗ ಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ನಡೆಸುವವರೂ ಕೂಡ ಕಾನೂನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಅದೇರೀತಿ, ಈ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೂ ಕೂಡ ಕೆಲವಾರು ನಿಯಮಾವಳಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬದ್ಧರಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ನಡೆಸ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಉದ್ದೇಶಪಟ್ಟು ಈ ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿರುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರೂ ಕೂಡ ತಕ್ಕ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ discretionary powers ಅನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಚಲಾಯಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ವಿರಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿ ಒಂದು ನಿಯಮಿತ ಚೌಕಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುವ ವಿಧಾನವನ್ನೂ ಈ ನಿಯಮಾವಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯೋಜನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

ಈಗ ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ನಾವು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಇದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಯಾರಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ದಿವಸಗಳಲ್ಲೇ ಮತ್ತೆ ನಾವು ಈ ನಿಯಮಾವಳಿಗಳನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕವರಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಗುಂಪಿನವರೂ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರೂ ಸಹ ಆ ಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರು ಯಾರನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆಯೋ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಏನೇನು ಸಲಹೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವುದಿದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಈಗಲೇ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಸಹಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಸಹಾಯವನ್ನು ಪಡೆದು ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಯಾವರೀತಿ ತಮ್ಮ ವಿಚಕ್ಷಣೆಯನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸಿ, ಎಲ್ಲರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೂ ಸಹ—ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಈ ಪ್ರಪಂಚದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರನ್ನೂ ಸಮಾಧಾನ ಪಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ ಇಲ್ಲ—ಲೋಕಾರೂಢಿಯಾಗಿ ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಸಮಾಧಾನ ಪಡಿಸ ಬಹುದು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅವರು ಆಲೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಸಹಾಯಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಸಲಹೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಸಲಹೆ ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ಈಗ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಕಷ್ಟ ಇರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೆ; ಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ನಡೆಸತಕ್ಕ ಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೆ ಅಷ್ಟು ಕಷ್ಟ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಬಹು ಭಾಗ ಅವರೆಲ್ಲಾ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದಷ್ಟು ಎಚ್ಚರಿಕೆಯಿಂದ ಇರಬೇಕಾದ ಪ್ರಮೇಯ ಇದಯೋ, ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡಿದರೂ ಸಹ ಎಚ್ಚರಿಕೆಯಿಂದ ಇರಬೇಕಾದ ಪ್ರಮೇಯ ಅಷ್ಟಾಗಿ ಕಾಣಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನನಗೆ ಎನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಈ ಕಡೆಯ ಇನ್ನೂ ಒಬ್ಬಿಬ್ಬರು ಜನರನ್ನು ಸಮಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸಹ ಈಗ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕವರು ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಆ ಮೂಲಕವೂ ಸಹಿತ ತಾವು ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿ. ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದಷ್ಟು ಈ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್‌ನಿಂದ ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕಷ್ಟಗಳು ಕೆಲವಾರು ಅನಿವಾರ್ಯವಾದವು, ಅವನ್ನು ಎದುರಿಸಿ (overcome) ತಡೆದಿಟ್ಟು ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋಗತಕ್ಕ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶ ನಮಗೆ ಬರಬಹುದು. ಅನೇಕ ಸಾರಿ ಹಿಡಿತ ತಪ್ಪಿ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶಗಳು ಇವೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಇವತ್ತಿನದೂ ಒಂದು ಹೌದೋ ಏನೋ ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಕಾನೂನಿಗನುಸರಿಸಿ ಕೆಲವಾರು ವಿಚಾರಗಳು ಇಲ್ಲದಾಗ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಕಷ್ಟ. ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಕೊಡುವವರಿಗೂ ಕಷ್ಟ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷೆಮಾಡತಕ್ಕವರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದೂ ಕಷ್ಟ. ಇಷ್ಟೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕಷ್ಟ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಇಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಯಾವಯಾವ ಸಲಕರಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸ ಬೇಕು, ಯಾವಯಾವ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಟ್ಟರೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಕಷ್ಟ ನಿವಾರಣೆ ಆದಾಪ್ಯ, ಯಾವರೀತಿಯಾದ ಆತ್ಮಗೌರವಕ್ಕೂ, ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳಿಗೂ ಚ್ಯುತಿಬಾರದಂತೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿನ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳು ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋದಾವು ಎಂಬ ಒಂದು ವಿಧಾನವನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, there are two motions before this House; one is moved by Sri Kothavale and the other by the Hon'ble Minister for Law. I may be permitted to speak on both the motions.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Speaking on the first motion moved by Sri Kothavale for consideration of the Rules Committee Report: I have gone through the report and I have very few observations to make. It is true that this Committee has gone through various questions and has made improvements in certain matters like Committee Subordinate Legislation, constitution of a Committee on Government Assurances, etc. To that extent

(SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN)

it is an improvement so far as the rights of members are concerned. Even in the matter of questions, as per Lok Sabha Rules, an amended form is sought to be adopted here which will help us in expeditious disposal of business; these are some of the ideas contained in the Report which move in the direction of improving the existing Rules of Procedure.

But there are certain others which strike me as tending towards restricting the rights in regard to scope of discussion, etc. It is in regard to one or two such matters that I wish to draw the attention of the House. For example, formerly, under rule 116 with regard to a motion of No-confidence, if 20 members approved of it, it was deemed sufficient for the Speaker to allow such a motion. According to the Report of the Rules Committee it is proposed to be fixed at 40, *i.e.*, as per rule 165 in the Report. It is true that a Motion of No-confidence against the Ministry or some such motion is not a remedy given to the Opposition because it will always be in a minority. But it is always necessary in a democratic set up to allow freedom for the minority to convert the majority. It is also necessary that the right to move a No-confidence Motion should not be whittled down in the manner in which it is done in the Rules Committee Report.

With regard to non-official business, it appears as though the intention of the Committee was to see that non-official business is not given sufficient priority. In our Rules, non-official business is given some kind of importance, if not adequate importance, at least some priority. Now the Rules Committee seeks to amend in such a direction that non-official business does not get sufficient priority. It will be open under the proposed rules for removing it altogether and see that Government business, Legislative business and such other business get priority. It is a very important right because in the entire session the time allotted for non-official business is very little and if even the right of priority to non-official business when it is put down in the order paper is sought to be taken away, it will be a serious infringement of the rights and privileges of members which they have been enjoying hitherto.

I only wish to point out that there are two aspects so far as the Report before this House is concerned; the earlier aspect helps towards efficient functioning and transaction of the business and the later aspect seeks to take away certain rights which are already in force. All these matters therefore deserve careful consideration. As my friend Sri Kenchappa, said, it is true that the experience in Lok Sabha and other bodies was not available to this Committee before the Report was drafted. Naturally within a short time they have done their job under this limitation.

So far as the second motion, *i.e.*, the amendment moved by the Hon'ble Minister for Law to the effect that the Report might be reconsidered by another Committee and another Report might be placed for consideration by this House is concerned, I am in agreement with the principle involved in the ruling given by the Chair. But my only quarrel is so far as the composition of the Committee is concerned. It is unfortunately weighted against the Opposition. Of course I am not trying to say that the question of majority or minority as in the matter of Bills will prevail here in the Committee. I hope that even though the Opposition may not be in complete majority the spirit of discussion will be such that decisions will not be taken by virtue of majority or only having political interests under consideration.

So, Sir, at any rate though it may not be decided by that Committee by a majority vote, I really feel that sufficient members from Opposition side ought to have been included and such a Committee directed to give a Report at an early date. Unfortunately the amending motion moved by the Hon'ble the Law Minister does not specify any time limit within which it has to give the Report.

SOME HON'BLE MEMBERS.—Ten days.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I am sorry, I did not notice it. So, so far as the amending motion is concerned, I do not know if I should move now the names that ought to be included in the list proposed by the Hon'ble the Law Minister, or at a later stage. I want a clarification from the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You can move an amendment to the amendment.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I beg leave of the House to move the following amendment:

> "That to the Committee suggested by ths Law Minister, the following names might be added:
>
> (1) Sri V. S. Patil
> (2) Sri B. K. Puttaramiya
> (3) Sri C. J. Mukkannappa."

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would like to know whether you would give it in writing.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Yes, Sir.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ (ಚನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನು ಈಗ ರಾ ಸಚಿವರು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ವಿರೋಧಿಸುವಾಗ ಈ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಸೂಚನೆಯ ಮೇಲಿರುವ ಎರಡು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನೂ ವಿರೋಧಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಸೂಚನೆ ತಂದಿರುವವರೇ ಹಾಜರಿಲ್ಲದಿರುವಾಗ ಬೇರೊಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಒಂದು ಸೂಚನೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. 1957ಕ್ಕೆ ಮೊದಲು ಜೂಲೈ ಎರೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಆಗಿದ್ದಂಥ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಸಭೆಯು ರಚಿಸಿದ್ದ ಸಮಿತಿ ವರದಿಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಆ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಮತ್ತು ಆ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರಾವಧಿ ಮುಗಿದಿದೆ. ಹಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ಇದೊಂದು ಹೊಸ ತರಹವೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ಕಾಲದ ಸಭೆಯೇ ಇಲ್ಲದಿರುವಾಗ ಆ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸದಸ್ಯತ್ವ ಮುಗಿದಿರುವಾಗ ಆ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಲ್ಲದಿರುವವರು ಸೂಚನೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಿಂದಿನ ಸಭೆಗೂ ಈ ಸಭೆಗೂ ಸಂಬಂಧವಿಲ್ಲ. ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವವರು ಹೊಸ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆ ಸಮಿತಿಗೂ ಅವರಿಗೂ ಯಾವ ವಿಧವಾದ ಸಂಬಂಧವಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ನಾನು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೇ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Dr. T. PARTHASARATHY (Malleswaram).—Was the Deputy Speaker a member of the Rules Committee previously?

Mr. SPEAKER.—No.

Dr. T. PARTHASARATHY.—Who is the person that delegated power to the Deputy Speaker to present the Report, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I was the Chairman of the Committee and I delegated the power.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಆಫ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್ ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದುದು. ಅದರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಾವು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಆಫ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್ ಅಂಡ್ ಕಂಡಕ್ಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಬಿಸಿನೆಸ್ ಏಕೆ ಮಾಡಿದೆಯೆಂದರೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಲ್ಪ ಸಂಖ್ಯಾತ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡುವುದೇ ಅದರ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಉದ್ದೇಶ. ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿರಬೇಕೆಂಬುದೇ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಚಾರ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರ ನಾವು ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಬ್ರಿಟಿಷ್ ಕಾನ್ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್‌ಅನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಮಾದರಿಯಾಗಿ ತಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಬ್ರಿಟನ್ನಿನ ಹೌಸ್ ಆಫ್ ಕಾಮನ್ಸಿನ ಮಾದರಿಯನ್ನನುಸರಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ 180 ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ಗಳೋ ಏನೋ ಇವೆ; ಮುಂದೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಆಗಬಹುದು; ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಬ್ರಿಟನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ 50-60 ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ಗಳು ಇರಬಹುದು. ಇದೆಲ್ಲಾ ಒಂದು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟದ್ದು. ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪ ಸುಸೂತ್ರವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದ ತಳಹದಿ ಈಗ ಬಹಳ ಭದ್ರವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮಗೆ, ಈ ಕಡೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಅಲ್ಪಸಂಖ್ಯಾತಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಬೇಕು. ನಾವು ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕು. ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೇ ನಿರಬೇಕೆಂಬ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ ನಾವು ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ತಂದಿರುವ ಸೂಚನೆ, ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ಭಯವಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಆಳುವ ಪಕ್ಷದಿಂದ ಸಮಿತಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡರೆ, ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡಲು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಅಧಿಕಾರಬೇಕೋ ಅಷ್ಟನ್ನು ಕೊಡದಿದ್ದರೆ, ಆಗ ನಮಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕುಂಠಿತವಾಗುವ ಒಂದು ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಅನ್ನು ಬಹುಮತ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಅಳವಡಿಸಿದರೆ ಆಗ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ವಿಚಾರ ಇಲ್ಲೇ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಬೇಕೇ ವಿನಾ ಸಮಿತಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಬಾರದು; ಸಮಿತಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಾದರೆ ಅದು ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಲು ಇದು ಬಿಲ್ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಇದು ಬಿಲ್ ಆಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಇದು ಹೋದರೆ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳ ಕಡೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಎಷ್ಟು ಗಮನ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆಗ ನಮಗೆ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಇಲ್ಲೇ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿ ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥವಾಗಬೇಕು; ಸಮಿತಿಗೆ ಹೋದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಹಕ್ಕಿಗೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆಂಬ ಶಂಕೆಯಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಸೂಚನೆಯೇನು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿದೆ ಮತ್ತು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯೇನಿದೆ ಅವನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಒಂದು

(ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ)

ನತ್ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವಿರಬೇಕು, ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ಗಳಿರಬಾರದು, ಒಂದು ಮಿತಿಯಿರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Dr. T. PARTHASARATHY.—I am raising a point of Order, Sir. I observe that the Leader of the Opposition has accepted the amendment but the member of the same party is opposing the amendment. I would like to know the parliamentary procedures to be observed among the party members.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not a point of order but it is only a point of information. When a Leader of the party accepts certain principles, the members of the party should accept them. But if any member does not confine himself to the accepted principle, it creates a situation which is not desirable. A member who desires to be a member of the party should subscribe to the principles and policies of that party. That is why the other day I said that something was wrong somewhere in the Praja Socialist Party. But this does not mean that I want to offend any member or the party. I only want the members to think and ponder over the fact and see that such a thing is not repeated. If they want to subscribe to certain principles, the members should see that their party members attack the policies of the Government according to the decisions they have taken. Otherwise it would not be conducive to the development of the party. It also puts the party in a sort of confusion and it also puts me in a state of confusion. So far as possible this may be borne in mind.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangud).—Sir, I have had occasion to refer this matter on a previous day when the Hon'ble Speaker was pleased to make certain observations. May I make this clear? Specially when a member of a particular party acts in a manner detrimental to the party.....

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO (Mysore).—I rise to a point of a order. I want to know whether we are considering the motion to refer the Report of the Committee to a Special Select Committee, or, discussing the conventions that this House should lay down, or what principles and what procedure the party should follow. I believe it is the parties that take decisions in the party meetings, but that it should not be discussed in the open House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not a point of order. We are of course discussing the Rules of Procedure and also amendments and this has cropped up incidentally.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Mysore).—Sir, the Chair was pleased to make certain observations about something which happened in this House on a point referred to by Dr. Parthasarathy. My Hon'ble friend Sri J. B. Mallaradhya is now trying to seek your approval to speak on that. I want to know when you permit others to make observations whether you will allow me an opportunity to express my observations also.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We will see later on.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The point which I wish to make is this. The Speaker was pleased to refer to the views expressed by a particular member of this party contrary to the views expressed by the Leader of that party. It is entirely a matter for the Leader of the party and the members of the party to take a decision in regard to the conduct of the particular member. I wish that this matter need not be made a subject matter of controversy or expression of opinion on the floor of this House. Whatever the conduct of that particular member may be, so long as it does not offend the rules laid down by this House or against its dignity, it should not be a subject matter of comment. Even if it is made directly or indirectly, it reflects on the party as a whole. Of course there are members and members in all the parties. I wish that the Hon'ble Speaker would very kindly have the courtesy of leaving it to us as to how these matters should be rectified.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, on a point of clarification. Sir, the observations made by you, I do not think, is a ruling. Otherwise it should apply to

the Congress party also. So far as this House is concerned, we find that the Congress Party, especially those Hon'ble Members who sit towards my left, violently differ from the Congress Official party, especially from the Treasury Benches and the party.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I request the Hon'ble Member, in that case, to bring the same to my notice. Of course, the Hon'ble Member is at liberty to bring to my notice such things, as Sri Parthasarathy brought to my notice. Sri Mallaradhya is under an impression that it is a matter between the members of the party. It is not so. After a party.....

(Sri K. Puttaswamy rose).

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—By way of clarification, Sir.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let Sri Puttaswamy speak.

*Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—The Hon'ble Member Sri J. B. Mallaradhya was pleased to refer that it was only the rules that govern our conduct in this Assembly. I beg to differ from that view. The rules are only there for our general guidance.

Dr. T. PARTHASARATHY.—On a point of order, Sir. The Hon'ble Member is not asking for clarification. He is discussing and saying what you have to say. Is he deputising for the Chair, Sir ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is not a point of order. Let him have his say.

Dr. T. PARTHASARATHY.—He is discussing the rules which you have to clarify.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will clarify it later on.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—It is conventions that govern our conduct in this Assembly. One of the well-known conventions is that party members should follow the lead given by the leader. I know that Hon'ble Member Sri Narasimhan made certain remarks about the attitude of certain members belonging to the Treasury Benches also. I wish he draws your attention at an appropriate occasion when we can give a correct and fitting reply to any point that he may raise. Sir, I contend that as far as this party is concerned, we have been acting as almost one man. I am not casting any aspersions on the other party. It is for the Hon'ble Speaker. It is between the Speaker and the members concerned. Hon'ble Speaker was pleased to make certain observations. In all humility, I submit it should have ended there. Anything said on the observations made by the Speaker would be certainly contradicting the Chair. I appeal to the Hon'ble Members of this House on both the sides that it is much better that we avoid taking an opportunity to make observations on the observations made by the Chair.

*Sri G. ANNA RAO (Afzalpur).—Hon'ble Member Sri Narasimhan was noting that this part of the House which consists of members became violent. Therefore, I have the right to answer rather than Sri Puttaswamy, because I am sitting on this side and Sri Narasimhan referred to this side. Anyhow, the remarks were not proper. We of the Congress Party have been functioning in a democratic manner. When we have not taken any collective decision, we individual members are free to express our opinion. When the matter comes before the party, it will be thrashed threadbare and we bring collective wisdom to bear upon the problem before us and then we take a decision. Therefore.....

*Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, I raise a point of order that we are not here to hear what happens in the party meetings and what discipline they are to keep and how they are going to behave outside or within the Assembly. We have to speak on the statement made by Sri Narasimhan whether it is correct or not and whether the members who are belonging to the Treasury Benches and who are sitting to the left of Sri Narasimhan are violent or not. Let the Hon'ble Member say that he is not violently behaving and that they are disciplined soldiers, and etc. But let him not make a lengthy statement. Therefore, I request the Chair not to allow any

(SRI C. J. MUCKANNAPPA)

Hon'ble Member of this House to pass remarks against one another and to wound the feelings of any member. I want a ruling from the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER.—After all, it is not a point of order; it is merely a lecture.

Sri G. ANNA RAO.—At any rate, you were kind enough to make the observation that it is the party which lays down certain conventions. Whether the party lays down certain conventions or not is left to the party itself. Anyhow, we the Congress members are a disciplined party. We discuss things and sometimes we differ. Therefore, it is not open to any other party to cast any aspersion on this side of the House. As far as party discipline is concerned, we should not express our views here. I think our party toes the line after full deliberation of the problems before it. I must say here that the minds of Congress Members are fully open so far as the rules of business are concerned. We have not taken a decision on this question. We may differ among ourselves, but after taking into consideration all the facts, if we come to a certain decision which we think to be correct, we stick to it. Before a certain decision is taken, we are not bound hand and foot and we can express our views. Our Leader has not expressed any opinion so far. If any member has expressed an opinion, it is the Leader of the Opposition and it is left to the members of that party to follow him or not. So far as Sri Narasimhan's remark is concerned, it is beside the point.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ನಾನು ಮತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದೆವು. ನಾನು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಾವಿಬ್ಬರೂ ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದುದರ ಮೇಲೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೋ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ತಪ್ಪು ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನಾವು ಒಂದು ತತ್ವ, ಒಂದು convention ಮೇಲೆ ಒಂದು ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ; ಬರೀ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿ ಇಪ್ಪೊತ್ತು ಒಂದು ಪಕ್ಷ, ನಾಳೆ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಪಕ್ಷ ಹೀಗೆ ಮನಸ್ಸು ಬಂದ ಹಾಗೆ ತಿರುಗಿಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾವು ಪ್ರಜಾಸಮ್ಮತವಾದ ಪಕ್ಷವನ್ನು ಸೇರಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರದು ತಪ್ಪೇ, ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರದು ತಪ್ಪೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಲು ಬೇರೆ ಕಮಿಟಿಗಳು ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿವೆ, ನಾವೆಲ್ಲ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಶಿಸ್ತಿಗೆ ಒಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ನಾನೇನಾದರೂ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯ ತತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ನನ್ನನ್ನು ನುಮ್ಮನೆ ಬಿಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲೂ disciplinary committee ಇವೆಲ್ಲ ಇವೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವರು ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆಂಬುದೂ ಸಹಗೊತ್ತು. ನಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅದೆಲ್ಲ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಶಿಸ್ತು ಇಲ್ಲದ ಜನ ಶಿಸ್ತನ್ನು ನಮಗೆ ಹೇಳಿಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾವು ಇತರರಿಗಿಂತ ಇನ್ನೂ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಜಾಗ್ರತೆಯಾಗಿ ಓಡು ತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ, ಅವರಿಗಿಂತ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗೋಣ ಎಂದು ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಏನೋ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ ಪಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಒಂದು ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಬೇಕಾಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯವನ್ನು ತಂದುಕೊಟ್ಟಂಥ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷವೂ ನುಮ್ಮನೆ ಹುಟ್ಟಿ ಲ್ಲ. ಅಂಥ ಒಂದು ಮಹಾನಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ನೀತಿ ನಿಯಮ ಗಳಿಗಿಂತಲೂ ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನೀತಿ ನಿಯಮಗಳು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೊರಟಿರುವಾಗ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಪರಿಪಾಲಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆನ್ನುವುದು ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಹಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ನಮಗೆ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ಯಾರೂ ಹೇಳಿಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ತಿದ್ದು ವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ disciplinary committee ಇದೆ. ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರು ತಪ್ಪುಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ತಿದ್ದುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಕಮಿಟಿ ಇರು ವಂತೆಯೇ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಒಂದು ಇದೆ. ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯ ವಿಷಯ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಬರಬಾರ ದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷದ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಲಿ, ಪಿ.ಎಸ್.ಪಿ. ವಿಷಯವಾಗಲಿ, ಕಮ್ಯುನಿಷ್ಟ್ ಪಕ್ಷದ ವಿಷಯ ಯಾವುದೇ ಪಕ್ಷದ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಲಿ ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರಬಾರದಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷ ರಲ್ಲಿ ವಿನಯದಿಂದ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

*Dr. T. PARTHASARATHY.—Sir, the speech of Sri Puttaramaya was a direct aspersion on my character and so I may be permitted to explain the position.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You will not be deprived of any right. As a matter of fact, nobody is going to be deprived of his right. You have raised a point of order. Since there has been some discussion, Sri V. S. Patil wants to take part in it. Let him finish and then you will have an opportunity later on.

Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum I).—Sir, I want to support the motion before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not on the motion but on the point of order and I have to give a ruling. I will give you a chance to speak on the motion before the House afterwards.

Dr. T. PARTHASARATHY.—Sir, I would like to clarify the position. The Hou'ble Member Sri Puttaramiya has

confused what I have said. I am also a member of the Opposition and I am anxious that the proceedings should go on in a smooth way. He has gone into the whole of my intention and in a fit of anger he said that I belong to a category which has no aspirations in the world and that I am a member who can go from one place to another. I am as good a member as the Hon'ble Member Sri Puttaramiaya is and I have the same intention and the same aspiration. I, therefore, want that his particular insinuations against me should be withdrawn. As regards the claim of Sri Puttaswamy that there is unity and discipline in the Congress Party, I would like to quote the glorious examples of the construction of the Vidhana Soudha and the effacing of the inscription at the main entrance of the Vidhana Soudha and leave it to the members to judge what agreement is there in that party.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I want to make the position clear. I must clear a sort of misunderstanding in the mind of my Hon'ble friend Sri Mallaradhya. I am not concerned with what is happening in the P.S.P. or the Congress outside. There are two criteria on which a party is recognised as an Opposition Party. The first is that it must subscribe to certain ideologies, principles and policies. Secondly, it must have a minimum number of members. Merely because the P.S.P. has 25 or 26 or 30 or 40 members, that is not a criterion for me to recognise that party. They should also come to a sort of understanding with me that one member will not speak against the other member or that the views of one member will not be opposed by another member of the same party.

Such implicit understanding should be there. To-day unfortunately such a situation arose where the leader of the party expressed his views and another member of the party expressed another set of views with the result that there was a little bit of confusion in my mind. Of course, if I were given to understand that the P.S.P. members had not made up their minds on this question and every member was free to express an opinion as he liked, then the question would not arise at all. On the contrary, what happened to-day is, when the party leader made a speech expressing a certain view, then I thought that the other members were bound by it. If that is not so, they may make it clear to me; then the matter ends. A party member should not act as a party member and then as an independent member at the same time. I am, in fact, very anxious about such happenings. So far as Sri M. C. Narasimhan is concerned, he has nothing to worry about such things because he is a leader of the party and he is also a follower. He is in a very advantageous position.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I form part of the opposition; I don't claim anything else.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I know that you form part of the opposition and then you are an opposition by yourself.

Sri H. C. LINGA REDDY (Malur).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, while supporting the motion moved by my friend Sri. Kothavale to which an amendment has been moved by the Law Minister, I would like to say a few words. I am afraid that while discussing the very rules which we would like to abide by later on, we are not sticking to the rules at all and I do not know, if the present state of affairs were allowed to be continued in the future, what the position in the House would be. We take up an issue; we deviate from it; we go against the rules; points of order are raised; one point of order is not disposed of and other points of order are raised; ultimately we deviate from the path and observe the rules more in the breach and there will be a good deal of confusion. Therefore, I appeal to the members through you, Mr. Speaker, that we have to consider the rules very carefully so that the proceedings of this House may be carried on very smoothly and very pecefully also. It is from that point of view I consider that it is time for us to think over the rules very deeply and it is good and I am indeed glad that able, and expert members have been

(SRI H. C. LINGA REDDY)

put on the Rules Committee including members on the other side and I do not think there is much force in the contention of my friend Sri. B. K. Puttaramiya inasmuch as the House can consider the very rules before us and discuss them in detail and they can come to correct conclusions.

In regard to a few rules over which the Report has been made by the Rules Committee, I would like to say a few words. Specially, I am glad that no limit has been put on the number of questions to be sent and with regard to the time up to which the questions have got to be tabled. The contention that some time limit may be imposed for sending questions, will not be correct. Because, Honourable Members of this House should be in a position to send questions at any time throughout the year and I believe the practice is like that in Bombay, Punjab, Madras and some other States. Because it is only when a question is sent that the Government and the Governmental officers and the heads of departments will immediately be alerted and only through a question we can bring certain grievances, and certain matters to the notice of the Government immediately. It may be that the question is not taken up immediately and it will not be possible to put supplementaries thereon, but all the same when a question is tabled and sent to the concerned department through you and through the Minister, then we know that some positive action will certainly be taken. The departmental head or his subordinate officers will be immediately paying attention to it. Otherwise, a very valuable right we will be losing. Formerly in this State we were allowed to send 6, 8 or 10 questions about a fortnight prior to the convening of the Assembly. We were not in a position to exercise the right to question the Government and our privilege to bring to the notice of Government certain things at any time we would like, was very much curtailed. Now I am very thankful to the Speaker who immediately after coming here and becoming the Speaker amended the rule in that respect and introduced the Bombay practice. From that point of view of the matter it is having a very salutary effect. An objection was raised by some Hon'ble Members to this privilege of sending any number of questions at any time and throughout the whole year on the ground that answers will not be received by the members or by the Legislature Secretariat from the Government in time. The remedy is to fix a time limit within which answers are to be received. Now in the rules that have been drafted by the Rules Committee, what the rule says is, reply to any question shall not be unduly delayed. I think this rule is observed more in the breach than in practice. Now we table certain questions and the answers to them will be received after three months, six months or sometimes nine months by which time the question would have become out of date. I put a question about the number of fair price depots and the prevailing rates of commodities; that was tabled six months back and in the recent session we received an answer. We know that the Government are not supplying food rations to fair price depots at present; the system has been discontinued at least in some of the towns. Therefore, the answer to that question becomes outmoded. At times answers have to be received urgently and the Government for some reason or other will not think of sending a reply at all. We know the question will have to be sent to the several departments for answer. I do not know at what level the answer will be delayed in being despatched to the Secretariat; probably at the level of the head of department or the concerned Minister, I am not in a position to say. We will have heard from the departmental head or the concerned officers that answers have been sent, but even then only after three months the answers are printed and placed before the Assembly. Therefore it is better that a time-limit is fixed. If about 15 or 20 days after the question is tabled answers were to be sent by the concerned department to the Legislature Secretariat, I think

there will be no difficulty at all. Members can serve and nurse their constituencies in a very effective and useful manner if a time-limit were to be fixed. I know in Lok Sabha ten days have been fixed within which answers have to be received and printed. As I said, several times answers will have been received ; but I do not know at what stage there will be delay. When the Central Government can receive answers through State Governments within ten days, I do not think there will be, at any rate, much difficulty for our Government to receive answers to at least about 75 per cent of the questions that we table. In a few cases there may be questions which may require a longer time ; then they may take the required time from the Speaker, and I think some arrangement can be made to receive answers for such questions also.

Another point I would like to refer to is : Usually the practice in this House hitherto was that immediately after the question hour some representations were being allowed to be made to the Speaker. Now we hear from the Speaker that no representations will be allowed to be made by the members or they cannot be allowed to bring certain difficulties or certain other matters to the notice of the Speaker here. I think it is a very valuable right and we the members will not be in a position to bring certain things to the notice of the Speaker at all. The suggestion made by the Speaker is that we may meet him at his chambers. No doubt, your good-self is always available and it is possible for us to meet and discuss matters with you and we are very thankful to you, Sir. All the same, if certain representations are made publicly on the floor of the House, then there will be other members to give their suggestions. All the members may not be in a position to meet the Speaker in his chambers. Therefore I believe it will be very useful if the right of making representations immediately after the question hour is conceded.

With regard to the distinction that is made between starred and unstarred questions and provided in the rules, I think there is no necessity at all for making any such distinction between the two. We have been tabling questions and receiving answers also. There may be certain questions which are of local interest but we are not accustomed to put many supplementaries on such questions. If a distinction should be made between starred and unstarred questions, we would like to star all the questions so much so there will be very few questions which will not be starred. Therefore I think such distinction between starred and unstarred questions is not necessary at all.

With regard to the rule that we have been following with regard to the Motion of Thanks—no doubt it is the practice of the House of Commons that we are following and that is also followed in the Legislatures all over India. I would like to make a suggestion to the members of the Special Committee to consider this aspect of the matter as to how best time can be allotted for the discussion of the Budget, because it is our practice and we know from experience that there will not be sufficient time for the members to speak on the Motion of Thanks and also on the Budget. We know for certain that the same members will be speaking both on the Motion of Thanks and also on the Budget while several other members will be losing that opportunity. What we have been doing is, though we are discussing the Governor's Address for two or three days we never fail to thank the Governor ultimately. It is very formal. Therefore instead of that we may straightaway thank him if any such thanks are necessary or do away with that rule itself and allow the time given for the discussion on Motion of Thanks for the Budget discussion itself.

With these few suggestions, I support the motion moved by Sri Kothavale.

Sri V. S. PATIL—Sir, I rise to support the motion brought by the Hon'ble Minister for Law. Framing of rules is pending from the last Assembly. We have spent about a year without doing practically anything. In fact under article 208 every Legislature when it comes into being is expected to

(SRI V. S. PATIL)

frame rules. I hope the present committee which is of the present House will go through all these details and bring out good rules. At the same time I should like to make a suggestion, and that suggestion is that when the new elements come in they practically do not know what the Rules of Procedure are and that is why we have seen that during the last year so many complications have arisen and so many points of orders were raised. We should incorporate a rule to the effect that when a new House comes into being the Speaker should hold a class for all members in order to teach them what the Rules of Procedure and functions are. And so long as a member has not passed that test he should not be allowed to sit here (Laughter).

SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.—What should be the minimum marks for passing the examination ?

SRI V. S. PATIL.—That should be decided by the rules. I am suggesting that because unless all of us know the rules, it is very difficult to follow the conduct of business of this House. Therefore, some provision may be made in the rules by which all the members will be well acquainted or learn the procedural law of this House.

MR. SPEAKER.—How to do it ?

SRI V. S. PATIL.—I should like to make one more suggestion and that suggestion is this. There was a hot discussion about the discipline of a party. Some of the members of the Congress Party said that they were working as one man. Some of the P.S.P. members said that they were a disciplined party. My experience for the whole year is to the contrary. Perhaps I may be mistaken. So far as the treasury benches are concerned, I fail to understand whether there is any kind of discipline in that party. I have seen the Congress members speaking against their own Ministers, a gainst their own Budget. What else is required ?

AN HON'BLE MEMBER.—They are offering remarks.

SRI V. S. PATIL.—Let us make some provisions in the Rules that if a member of the party goes against the policy of that party, some disciplinary action should be taken in this House. That will teach us to have some discipline and will teach us to how we should behave in this House.

MR. SPEAKER.—What about your party ?

SRI V. S. PATIL.—My party is not recognised here. If I can form the opposition party, then I shall be bound by the party discipline as we used to be in Bombay. I do not wish to make any difference between Mysore and Bombay. But, at the same time, I should like to have disciplined and well organised parties, opposition as well as treasury benches, and any body who comes here to see our work must be impressed with our behaviour. That is why I have made the suggestion.

SRI K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO — Sir, I think the time spent today is well spent, so far as I am concerned, because we have understood what procedure we should follow, how we should conduct ourselves and what are the conventions that must be followed. Sir, Sri V. S. Patil made certain references. I do not know whether he meant them in all seriousness. I was just wondering what should happen to a class he suggested, which is to be presided over by the Speaker who is as fresh as the members themselves.

MR. SPEAKER.—No, no. I would not like to be a teacher at all.

(*Laughter*)

SRI K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Question of discipline and all that are not warranted by the Constitution under which we are functioning in the State.

Comments were made about the conventions of the British Parliament. Well, the member who quoted about conventions, himself forgot to follow the well laid convention. The convention is that when the Leader of the Party, whether it is the treasury bench or the opposition or the independents, takes a definite stand, it is the bounden duty

on the part of the members of his party to fall in line with him. My Hon'ble friend who spoke about conventions, observed it more in its breach than in its observance.

Next, a reference was made about the volume of the Report of the Committee. Democracy is new to us and we are likely to commit mistakes. But it is only by trial and error we can build up well established conventions. Therefore, it is better we follow certain rules of procedure well defined. Otherwise what we witnessed an hour ago, would be repeated in this very House. Unless the Speaker under such circumstances comes to the rescue of the House, the House will be driven to a sort of pandemonium. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary to have well defined and clear rules lest any interpretation is possible on the procedures.

Then, certain comments were made about the Treasury Bench. I thought the members opposite would concede that we are people who are not afraid. We are not a people to hide things that are against the procedure, practice, convention or against the policies or principles. After all we are human beings and we are likely to commit mistakes. Whenever such mistakes occur, as a party we would not hide things but tell the House through the Speaker and draw the attention of the Leader to such things. That is the convention that we have been following. If that should be mistaken and it is thought that there are dissensions in the party, I am afraid it may not be correct and they are disillusioned. Well, Sir, we call a spade, a spade.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I want some information, if the Hon'ble Member yields. Is this the convention followed by other political parties in the progressive democracies all the world over? The Hon'ble Member states that they call a spade, a spade.....

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—There is a little hasty thinking. We have to bear in mind that attacking the policy of the Government and the minor ministerial tangle has no consonance whatsoever when compared with the overall functions. If this distinction is kept in mind, the comments will be very clear.

*Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—Sir, there is a provision in the rules to the effect that any member while speaking on the floor of the House will have to confine his remarks to the subject on which he is called upon to speak and also there is the question of relevancy. When we have been thinking of having well defined rules, we have been talking of various other things. Is such a thing relevant? Is there no provision at all in the Rules of Procedure which empowers the Speaker to control the business of the House and direct the members to speak only on the subject on hand?

5 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—After all, the point of order has come up too late. When everybody has spoken on the point, this point of order has been raised. Let us not bother ourselves with the point of order. The Rules of Procedure are so mingled up as to have some sort of relation to the conduct of the party and individual members. It started and it has gone a little bit far. At this stage, I can only appeal to the members. Let them restrain themselves in making remarks on this point. If they touch a point here and there they may do so. But there are some people who don't like it. Why should we wound their feelings? Let us be as brief as possible.

Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—I am constrained to express that in this respect there has been so much talk which is irrelevant

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—I am not happy about this remark of irrelevancy.

Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—I do say, Sir, because we have been discussing something about the rules of practice and conduct of business and while doing so there was so much of talk and time devoted to a matter not concerned with the proposition of the rules of procedure and conduct of business. On the other hand we have been devoting much time to that matter —much more

(SRI K. KENCHAPPA)

than what we should have ordinarily devoted. Another fact is, when there are clear rules to the effect that a person has got to speak only with reference to the subject on hand and if a member goes on speaking without having due regard to the subject, dilating on other subjects, where is the end? I appeal that, hereafter at least, such things will not take place. Because we spend the valuable time of the House. Every day we are spending so much of money. While doing so we have got to be somewhat careful when talking about a subject. Instead of dealing with the subject on hand, if we go on speaking on other subjects, we will be wasting the time of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not know whether I can fully agree with Sri Kenchappa. I can agree with him to a certain extent. But the question of irrelevancy has been on all sides. I do not want to blame anybody. I would like to blame myself. I have been hearing speeches which are not strictly relevant to the issue. That has been the case. Sometimes some member takes the initiative and goes on speaking without my permission. It is no use saying that this much is relevant or this much is irrelevant. But it is much better that all of us remember one fact, that we should all be restrained. I agree with Sri Kenchappa that remarks in this House have not been all relevant. To a certain extent they have been irrelevant. But there can be very little margin between the relevancy or irrelevancy of the remarks. If I say that certain remarks are relevant, the next question that will come up is how can it be relevant? I am always reluctant to check members. But they sholud not be too irrelevant. I have heard certain members speaking many irrelevant things and just at the moment I intended to pull them up, they would come to the point.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Sir, I had to say a few things because of certain comments made. We were talking of conventions a little earlier and I was speaking about the infant democracy that we are practicing. In an infant democracy, where the Opposition is not either well-organised or is ill-organised, then the responsibility of offering healthy criticism unfortunately falls on the Treasury Benches themselves.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—What is this thing Sir? Is it not casting aspersions on the other party? There is no monopoly of wisdom by any one party. The Hon'ble Speaker was pleased to make a remark just now that we should not wound other parties . . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—I did say that Hon'ble Members should be restrained in their speeches. I also said that we should not offend others. So far as possible, I request once again and appeal to all the members to avoid making remarks which will offend others.

Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—Suppose the directions given by the Hon'ble Speaker are not respected, how are the members to be protected?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Kenchappa has been here for a whole year. He has known what it is. We need not be sentimental about it. Sometimes, somewhere, we have to take remarks very cooly and calmly.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Without going further into the controversy, I only wish to state that it was never my intention to wound anybody's feelings. I may not have used a flowery language as others have used. In so far as the Rules of Procedure are concerned, there are so many things that we should observe and follow. But sometimes, when we are discussing, it may create a little stir in the House. But I believe we have to put up with it.

On the merits of the Report, the Committee is to go into the whole question and to place before us their observations within a period of ten days. I have also tabled a few amendments and I take it that the Committee will give its utmost consideration to the various amendments moved and when the report is represented to the House, I hope the House accepts that report at least, with least comments in view

of the time taken to refer the matter to a Select Committee.

* ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಸ್. ಶಂಕರಪ್ಪ (ಹೊನಡುರ್ಗ).—ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಈ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಸ್ಪೆಷಲ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಬೆಂಬಲ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಅರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಇಚ್ಚಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಒಂದನೆಯದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸರ್ವಾರದಿಂದ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಕೇಳುವುದು ಆಗಲಿ, ಅವರ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕೆಲಸಕಾರ್ಯ ಆಗಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಆಗಲಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೂರು ದ್ವಾರ ಇದೆ. ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ, ಎರಡನೆಯದು ನಿರ್ಣಯ, ಮೂರನೆಯದು ಕಟ್ ಮೋಷನ್. ಇವತ್ತಿನ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಆಫ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಿದೆ ಅದರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸಭೆ ದೊಡ್ಡದು ಆಯಿತು. ಬಹಳ ಕಟ ಮೋಷನ್‌ಗಳು ಬಂದು ಒಂದೊಂದನ್ನು ಮುಂಡಿಸಿ ಉತ್ತರ ಪಡೆಯತಕ್ಕ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲದಂತಾಗಿದೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಮಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಕಟ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ಉತ್ತರ ಪಡೆಯತಕ್ಕ ಹಕ್ಕಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಟ್ಟಿನಮೇಲೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಒಂದು ಕಟ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ಅನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮುಂಡಿಸಿ, ಅದನ್ನು ವಿವರವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಉತ್ತರ ಪಡೆದನಂತರ ವಾಪಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಹಿಂದೆ ಇತ್ತು. ಈಗ ಸಭೆ ದೊಡ್ಡದಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಸೂಚಿತವಾಗಿದೆ.

ಎರಡನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳ ವಿಚಾರ, ಈ ದಿವನ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಲಿಂಗಾರೆಡ್ಡಿಯವರು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯ. ಈಗ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ದಿವಸಗಳಾದರೂ ಉತ್ತರ ಜಾಗ್ರತೆ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೆ ಬಾರದಿದ್ದರೆ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಿಲ್ಲ. ಮೊದಲು 8 ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಬಹುದೆಂದಿತ್ತು. ಅವಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಯಮಿತ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಈ ದಿವನ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ; ಜೂನ್, ಜುಲೈ, ತಿಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಉತ್ತರ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಸಮಿತಿಯು ಈ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ತಕ್ಕ ಉತ್ತರ ನಿಯಮಿತ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುವಹಾಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಮ್ಮ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸಿದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಮೂರನೆಯದಾಗಿ, ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹೋದ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ 40 ಅಥವಾ 50 ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳು ಬಂದಿದ್ದವೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ, ನರಿಯಾಗಿ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ—ಆ ಪೈಕಿ ಒಂದೇ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಕೂಡ ಬರಲಿಲ್ಲ, ಬಾಕಿ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳು ಲ್ಯಾಪ್ಸ್ ಆದವು. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಮುಂಡಿಸುವಾಗ ಒಂದು ಕನಬನ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನೋ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇರೊಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನೋ ವಿಶದೀಕರಿಸಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅನಂತರ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುವವರೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸಮರ್ಥಿಸುವವರೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವಂತೆ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕ ನಿಯಮವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕ್ಯುಲರ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಕಿದರೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳು ಲ್ಯಾಪ್ಸಾಗುವುದು ತಪ್ಪುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅನೇಕ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬಾರದೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಆಗಬೇಕಾದ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಎರಡು ವಿಷಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪೂರ್ಣಗಮನ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palaiyam).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, much has been said on the motion brought by my Hon'ble friend Sri Kothavale and also on the amendment brought by the Hon'ble Minister for Legal Affairs. I do not like to take the time of the House by going into the details except to say that the opinions expressed by my Hon'ble friends Sri Linga Reddy and Sri Narasimhan should be taken into consideration. Sri Narasimhan laid special emphasis on the fact that adequate importance should be given to the non-official business. Out of every fourteen days allotted for official business, two days are allotted for non-official business. I do not know whether holidays are included in it. However, it is something that can be appreciated. I think that by giving some more days for non-official business, we will have an opportunity to express our views on the policies of Government in respect of the various works.

I have already submitted that the rules to be finally approved should not be inconsistent with all the good conventions and customs that have been established so far. Since there is scope to discuss the rules after they emerge from the Special Committee, I do not want to take much time on that now. Sri Narasimhan has suggested some names for inclusion in the Committee by means of an amendment. I also take this opportunity of suggesting the inclusion of the name of Sri Mallaradhya in the list of members proposed by the Minister for Legal Affairs.

* Sri G. ANNA RAO.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to offer a few remarks on the motion before the House.

The rules are framed mainly to facilitate the conduct of business of this House in a smooth manner. The objective is to streamline the business of this House so as to carry on the business of this House in an effective manner. Therefore, it is not the rules which facilitate the conduct of business but it is the spirit with which this

(SRI G. ANNA RAO)

House considers the problems before it that facilitates it. However perfect the rules may be, it is the spirit with which the whole House works them that facilitates the conduct of business in this House. No doubt, there are certain bottlenecks which have to be crossed. The object is that this House should transact business in a smooth manner. I suggest that in the light of the experience we have gained so far, some changes should be made in the rules.

There are some difficulties in the way of the members in putting questions and in other matters also. We address questions to the Government with a view to elicit information and so that information should come in time. But that object is defeated in view of the fact that delays occur in sending the questions and there is also no time limit prescribed under the present rules. Therefore, I suggest that a definite period should be fixed within which the Government should send the answers to the questions. A fixed period, say, 10 days or at the most 15 days should be fixed within which the Government should send the answers. Secondly, the questions that are put by an individual member are considerable. Therefore, it is very essential that a limit should be fixed so that each member of this House may have occasion to have the answers for the questions tabled by him. Hence, I suggest that the maximum number of questions that may be answered orally should be two or three and the other questions should be unstarred. Starred questions have much importance and the members also feel their importance. Therefore, whatever answers come in the Assembly and the supplementaries that are put thereon are of great importance. Therefore, the questions should be limited and they may be two or three at the most. They should be starred ones and the other ones which are not answered on the floor of the House should be turned into unstarred questions.

The powers of this House and the powers of the Speaker should be so divided that a balance is kept between them. There are various committees constituted and therefore the question arises whether the Speaker should nominate all the committees or whether these committees should be elected. Here also, some members may feel that every committee, whether it be a Committee of Privileges or Public Accounts Committee or Library Committee or Petitions Committee, whichever committee it may be—should be elected by this House. Here again, the question arises as to which are the important commitees. I suggest that as many committees as are very important should be elected by this House. In order to give due weight to the opinion of the Opposition, we should lay down a rule that the election should be by means of a single transferable vote. There are committees which are not so important. Therefore, the Speaker should be given some powers to nominate such committees.

For instance, I may consider that the Library Committee and the House Committee are not so important. Therefore, the Speaker should be given an opportunity or power to nominate the committees. We need not insist that the House may exercise its power and must necessarily elect members to these committees. Then there is the Committee on Subordinate Legislation which is very important in these days. When there are provisions it is quite proper for the Government to exercise powers and framesuch rules as are not beyond the jurisdiction. Therefore, the Committee on Subordinate Legislation is a very important one and I submit that members of such committees should be elected by this House. Moreover, there are various questions which are raised in the House. Therefore, wide discretion should be given to the Speaker to decide and give rulings. The domain of the powers of the Speaker and the powers of the House may be so defined as not to clash, one with the other. In these days for every thing there cannot be a law. Therefore, I submit that the Committee which is to be constituted for the purpose should consider all these matters and suggest suitable rules of procedure and the

rules to be adopted unanimously should be such as to facilitate the transaction of the business of the House smoothly and efficiently.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಸುಬ್ಬಯ್ಯ ನಾಯಕ್ (ಪುತ್ತೂರು ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿಗಳು).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೆ, ನಾನು ಕೂಡ ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾವು ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಉಲ್ಲೇಖಿಸಿ, ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಯುವ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ, ಆತುರತೆ, ಅಗತ್ಯ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬೇಗ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನನಗೂ ಮತ್ತಿತರ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೂ ಹೊತ್ತಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸುಮಾರು 6-8 ತಿಂಗಳುಗಳಿಂದ ಉತ್ತರ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ನಾಲ್ಕರಿಂದ ಆರು ತಿಂಗಳ ಒಳಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರುವ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಬೇಕು. ಸರ್ವೇಸಾಧಾರಣವಾಗಿ ಒಬ್ಬರು 10-20 ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿರಬಹುದು. ಒಬ್ಬೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೂ ದಾಮಾಷಾ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರುವಂತೆ ನಿಶ್ಚಯ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೂ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಮಾಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ತರ ದೊರಕುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು.

ಈ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಒಂದು ನಿಯಮವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಹೋದಸಲ ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ್ದ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೋ ಎರಡೋ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬಂದುವು. ಬಾಕಿ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳು ಗಾಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಗದ ಹಾಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಬೇಕು.

ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಲ್ಲಿ ವಿನಯಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯತೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಬಹುಶಃ ಇಂಗ್ಲೀಷ್ ಬರುವವರಿಗೆ ಕನ್ನಡ ಬಂದೇ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಕನ್ನಡ ಭಾರದೆ ಇರುವ ಕೆಲವು ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಭಾಷಣದ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವು ಬೇರೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಮತ್ತು ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಸಹಕರಿಸಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡುವಂಥ ತೀರ್ಮಾನಗಳು ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವಂಥ ವಿಧಾನ ಕ್ರಮಗಳ ಅಥವಾ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳ ಸೂಚನೆ, ಇತ್ಯಾದಿಗಳು, ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೂ ತಿಳಿಯಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಂದಿ, ಕನ್ನಡ, ಇಂಗ್ಲೀಷ್ ಮರಾಠಿ ಭಾಷೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಷಣಗಳಾಗುತ್ತವೆ, ಆದರೆ ಕನ್ನಡ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುವಂತಾಗಬೇಕು. ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಷಣ ಮಾಡಲು ಸಮರ್ಥರಾದ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಭಾಷಣ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು, ತಮ್ಮ ಮೂಲಕ ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿವೇದಿಸಲು ಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ (ಚಾಮರಾಜನಗರ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈಗ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದ ಆಧಾರದಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಬಂಧನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ, ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಆಚರಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಮೂರು ನಿಬಂಧನೆಯ ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳಿವೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಪಾರ್ಲಮೆಂಟಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಬಂದು ಪುಸ್ತಕವೂ ಸಹ ಇದೆ. ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯವರು ಆಚರಿಸತಕ್ಕಂಥ ನಿಬಂಧನೆಯ ಕೆಲವು ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳು ಇವೆ. ಇವೆಲ್ಲ ವನ್ನೂ ಅವಲೋಕಿಸಿದಲ್ಲಿ, ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ "ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಆಫ್, ದಿ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ" ಮತ್ತು ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೋಲಿಸಿ ನೋಡಿದರೆ, ಕೆಲವು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಅಂಶಗಳೂ ಇವೆ, ಕೆಲವು ವಿರೋಧಿನ ತಕ್ಕಂತ ಅಂಶಗಳೂ ಕಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತವೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ವಿಷಾದದಿಂದ ನೋಡ ಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ನೋಡುವಾಗ ಎರಡು ಮೂರು ಮುಖದಲ್ಲಿ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಮಾಡಿ ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಮೊದಲನೆಯದು, ಈ ನಿಬಂಧನೆಯಿಂದ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಮೊಟಕು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯ; ಮತ್ತೊಂದು, ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು—ಇವತ್ತು ಭಯವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೇಳಬಹುದು—ಸಭೆಯ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆವಕಾಶವಿದೆಯೇ; ಮೂರನೆಯದು, ಶಾಸನಾಂಗ, ಕಾರ್ಯಾಂಗದಿಂದ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾಗಿ, ಅದು ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ತನ್ನ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯ ಮತ್ತು ಹಕ್ಕು ಭಾದ್ಯತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ನಿಬಂಧನೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸಾಧ್ಯ. ಎಂಬುವು ಈ ಮೂರು ತತ್ವಗಳ ಆಧಾರದಮೇಲೆ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಪಟ್ಟರೆ, ಕೆಲವು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಶಾಸನನಭೆಯ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಪೊಟಕು ಬರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳು ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತವೆ. ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಸ್ಥಾನದ ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬಂದಾಗ, ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ನೋಡಿದರೆ, ಅದು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ ನಿಬಂಧನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಮೋಷನ್ ಮೂವ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಡಿವಿಷನ್ಸಿಗೆ ಪ್ರೆಸ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. The principle of proportional representation by means of the single transferble vote, ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೈ ಬಿಟ್ಟುಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಸಂಶಯಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ.

MR. SPEAKER.—The procedure for electing the Speaker is copied from the House of Commons. ಲೋಕನಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಇದೇ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇದೆ. ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿಯಲ್ಲಿ "secret ballot" ನಿಂದ ಎಲೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಇದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ.—ಯಾರಾದರೂ ತಪ್ಪು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟುಬಿಟ್ಟು, ತಪ್ಪಿಲ್ಲದಂತೆ ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಿ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಧ್ಯೇಯಗಳಿವೆಯೋ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ನಾವು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ. ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮೋಷನ್ ಮೂವ್ ಆಗಿ, ಡಿವಿಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಪ್ರೆಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾಗ, ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಒಂದು ಮನಸ್ಸನ್ನು ಕೆಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟವಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೂ, ಅವರಿಗೇ ಓಟು ಮಾಡುವ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬಂದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸೀಕ್ರೆಟ್ ಬ್ಯಾಲಟ್ ಸಿಸ್ಟಮ್ ಇಂಟ್ರೊಡ್ಯೂಸ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು.

ಇನ್ನು ಕೆಲವು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಬಾರ್ಡಿನೇಟ್ ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೇಷನ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಪವರ್ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಇದೆ. ಈ ಮನೂದೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥವರು ಡ್ರಾಫ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ, ಈ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮಾಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಕೆಲವು ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಸಹ ಅದನ್ನು ಪರ್ಯಾಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಏನು ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂಬ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ)

ವಿಷಯ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾವು ಯಾವ ಆಕ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕಹಾಗೆ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲ ಅದನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ಅಥವಾ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಮೇಲೆ ನಮ್ಮ ತಿಳಿವಳಿಕೆಗಾಗಿ ರೆಫರ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯ. ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಈ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ಮುಂದೆ ತರಬೇಕು, ಕಮಿಟಿ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಸಭೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟನಂತರ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಪಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯವನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲ ಎಷ್ಟುಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಕಸಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಹಕ್ಕುಭಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳನ್ನು, ಘನತೆ ಗೌರವಗಳನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಪೂರ್ಣವಾದ ಮನಸ್ಸಿದೆ. ಆ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಚಟುವಟಿಕೆ ಬಹಳ ಫ್ರೀ ಆಗಿ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಹಾಗೆ ಇರಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಕೆಲವು ನಿಬಂಧನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಬೇಕು. ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ವಿಧಾನಮಂಡಲದ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟೇರಿಯಟ್ಟಿನ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ, ಅದು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದ ಕೈವಾಡದಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದ ಕೈವಾಡ ತಪ್ಪಬೇಕು. Separate Secretariat ಇರಬೇಕು. ಕಾರ್ಯಾಂಗಕ್ಕೂ, ಶಾಸನಾಂಗಕ್ಕೂ, ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗಕ್ಕೂ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾದ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಇವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾದ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಅಕ್ಷರಶಃ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಇಲ್ಲವೆನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವಾಗ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲವೋ ಆಗ ಇತರ ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಷಯಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಒಂದು ಕೊಕ್ಕೆ ಇದ್ದೇ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅನುಭವವಿರತಕ್ಕವರು ಮಾತ್ರ ಇಂಥ ವಿಷಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಕುಂದುಕೊರತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬಹುದೇ ಏನಾ ಬೇರೆಯವರು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಪುಸ್ತಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಓದಿದರೆ ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅನುಭವದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಪೂರ್ಣ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯವಿರುವ ಏರ್ಪಾಡನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

ಕಟ್‌ಮೋಷ್ ಕಳುಹಿಸುವ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಕಳೆದ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭಾಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮೆಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ಕಟ್‌ಮೋಷನ್ನುಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೆವು. ಆಗ ಒಂದು devise ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಕಟ್‌ಮೋಷನ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರೂ ನೂಚಿಸಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕ, ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದು, ಕಟ್‌ಮೋಷ್ಕಗಳಲ್ಲಿರುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಗಣನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ಆ ಕಟ್‌ಮೋಷ್ಕಗಳನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ಬಹಳ ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತಿಕೆಯಿಂದ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ; ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಏನೂ ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಘಂಟಾ ಘೋಷವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಬಲ್ಲೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕಟ್‌ಮೋಷ್ಕಗಳಲ್ಲಿರುವ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಿಬಂಧನೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚಿಸಬೇಕು ಮತ್ತು ಆ ರೀತಿ ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದರ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಸಭೆಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದುದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—"Committee of Assurance" ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇದು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ.—ಇಂಥ ವಿಷಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಪೆಸಿಫಿಕ್ ಆಗಿ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ

ನಾನು ಮೇಲೆ ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಮೂರು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲಕ್ಕೂ ಮತ್ತು ಶಾಸನಸಭೆಗೂ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾದ ವ್ಯವಹಾರವಿರಬೇಕು. ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲ ಶಾಸನಸಭೆಯ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಿತ್ತುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲದಂತೆ ನಿಬಂಧನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲಕ್ಕೂ ಮತ್ತು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೂ ಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾದ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸತಕ್ಕ, ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ, ವ್ಯವಹಾರದಲ್ಲಿ, ಆಡಳಿತದಲ್ಲಿ, ಎಲ್ಲದರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯವಿರತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಉತ್ತಮವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಬಾಕಿವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದಾಗ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I shall put the amendments to the House: The question is :

"That the following Members be added to the Committee :—

Sriyuths :—

V. S. Patil
B. K. Puttaramiya
C. J. Mukkannappa, and
Dr. T. Parthasarathy."

The motion was negatived.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—I would have been very glad to have the names included but for the circumstance that practically 20 members are already on the Committee and it will become a little unwieldy.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—I wanted to move my amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is too late. The question is :

"That the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly, as reported by the Rules Committee, be referred to a Special Committee consisting of the following Hon'ble Members for further consideration with a direction that the Report of the Committee be presented to

the House within a period of 10 days from today:

Sriyuths—

1. Hon'ble the Speaker (*Chairman*)
2. K. Kenchappa.
3. Kadidal Manjappa.
4. H. S. Rudrappa.
5. J. H. Shamsuddin.
6. H. V. Koujalgi.
7. B. D. Jatti.
8. G. Anna Rao.
9. K. Hanumanthaiya.
10. V. Venkatappa.
11. A. Bheemappa Naik.
12. T. Subramanya.
13. N. Rachiah.
14. A. V. Narasimha Reddy.
15. V. Srinivas Shetty.
16. S. Sharangowda.
17. M. C. Narasimhan.
18. Y. Veerappa.
19. B. R. Sunthankar.
20. Smt. K. S. Nagarathnamma and the mover."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise and meet tomorrow at 1 P.M. and take up legislative business.

The House adjourned at Thirty-seven Minutes past Five of the Clock to meet again at One of the Clock on Tuesday, the 4th March 1958.

WD 81—GPB—900—30-6-58